

12. Multiple test corrections

"Natural selection is a mechanism for generating an exceedingly high degree of improbability"

Ronald A. Fisher

JELLY BEANS
CAUSE ACNE!

SCIENTISTS!
INVESTIGATE!

BUT WE'RE
PLAYING
MINECRAFT!
...FINE.



WE FOUND NO
LINK BETWEEN
JELLY BEAN
ACNE ($P > 0$)



THAT SETTLES THAT.
I HEAR IT'S ONLY

News

GREEN JELLY BEANS LINKED TO ACNE!

95% CONFIDENCE

ONLY 5% CHANCE
OF COINCIDENCE!



SCIENTISTS...

WE FOUND NO
LINK BETWEEN
PURPLE JELLY
BEANS AND ACNE
($P > 0.05$).



WE FOUND NO
LINK BETWEEN
BROWN JELLY
BEANS AND ACNE
($P > 0.05$).



WE FOUND NO
LINK BETWEEN
TEAL JELLY
BEANS AND ACNE
($P > 0.05$).



WE FOUND NO
LINK BETWEEN
SALMON JELLY
BEANS AND ACNE
($P > 0.05$).



Gene expression experiment

Differential expression: compare gene expression in two conditions (e.g. by t-test)

	gene_id	p.value
1	GENE00001	0.040503700
2	GENE00002	0.086340732
3	GENE00003	0.552768467
4	GENE00004	0.379025917
5	GENE00005	0.990102618
6	GENE00006	0.182729903
7	GENE00007	0.923285031
8	GENE00008	0.938615285
9	GENE00009	0.431912336
10	GENE00010	0.822697032
11	GENE00011	0.004911421
12	GENE00012	0.873463918
13	GENE00013	0.481156679
14	GENE00014	0.442047456
15	GENE00015	0.794117108
16	GENE00016	0.214535451
17	GENE00017	0.231943488
18	GENE00018	0.980911106
19	GENE00019	0.422162464
20	GENE00020	0.915841637
...		

← 1 in 20 chance of a false positive

10,000 genes

~500 genes are “significant” by chance

Even unlikely result will eventually happen
if you repeat your test many times

Let's perform a test m times

		Reality		
		No effect	Effect	Total
Test result	Significant	<i>FP</i>	<i>TP</i>	D ← Number of discoveries
	Not significant	<i>TN</i>	<i>FN</i>	$m - D$
	Total	m_0	m_1	m ← Number of tests

False positives

True positives

True negatives

False negatives

Family-wise error rate

$$FWER = \Pr(FP \geq 1)$$

Probability of winning at least once

Play lottery

Probability of winning is α

Events	Probability
	α
	$1 - \alpha$

Events	Probability
	$\alpha \times \alpha$
	$\alpha \times (1 - \alpha)$
	$(1 - \alpha) \times \alpha$
	$(1 - \alpha)^2$

← Probability of not winning at all

Probability of winning at least once
 $1 - (1 - \alpha)^2$

False positive probability

H_0 : no effect
Set $\alpha = 0.05$

One test

Probability of having a false positive

$$P_1 = \alpha$$

Two independent tests

Probability of having at least one false positive in either test

$$P_2 = 1 - (1 - \alpha)^2$$


m independent tests

Probability of having at least one false positive in any test

$$P_m = 1 - (1 - \alpha)^m$$


Family-wise error rate (FWER)

Probability of having at least one false positive
among m tests; $\alpha = 0.05$



Bonferroni limit – to control FWER

Probability of having at least one false positive among m tests; $\alpha = 0.05$



Controlling FWER

We want to make sure that

$$FWER \leq \alpha.$$

Then, the FWER is controlled at level α .


Bonferroni limit

Apply smaller limit per test, α' .

$$\alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{m}$$


Test data (1000 independent experiments)

Random samples, size $n = 5$, from two normal distributions



- We have 1000 data sets
- Each set contains 5 values
- We perform one-sample t-test for each sample
- Null hypothesis: $\mu = 20 \text{ g}$

1000 t-tests, $H_0: \mu = 20$ g



No correction			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	56	30	86
Not significant	914	0	914
Total	970	30	1000

One sample t-test, $H_0: \mu = 20$ g

No correction			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	$FP = 56$	$TP = 30$	86
Not significant	$TN = 914$	$FN = 0$	914
Total	970	30	1000

False positive rate

$$FPR = \frac{FP}{m_0} = \frac{FP}{FP + TN}$$

$$FPR = \frac{56}{56 + 914} = 0.058$$

False negative rate

$$FNR = \frac{FN}{m_1} = \frac{FN}{FN + TP}$$

$$FNR = \frac{0}{0 + 30} = 0$$

Bonferroni limit

	No correction	Bonferroni
α	0.05	5×10^{-5}
<i>FPR</i>	0.058	0
<i>FNR</i>	0	0.87

No correction			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	56	30	86
Not significant	914	0	914
Total	970	30	1000

Bonferroni			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	0	4	4
Not significant	970	26	996
Total	970	30	1000

Holm-Bonferroni method

Sort p-values

$$p_{(1)}, p_{(2)}, \dots, p_{(m)}$$

Reject (1) if $p_{(1)} \leq \frac{\alpha}{m}$


Reject (2) if $p_{(2)} \leq \frac{\alpha}{m-1}$

Reject (3) if $p_{(3)} \leq \frac{\alpha}{m-2}$

...

Stop when $p_{(k)} > \frac{\alpha}{m-k+1}$


Holm-Bonferroni method
controls FWER



k	p	α	$\frac{\alpha}{m}$	$\frac{\alpha}{m-k+1}$
1	0.003	0.05	0.01	0.01
2	0.005	0.05	0.01	0.0125
3	0.012	0.05	0.01	0.017
4	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.025
5	0.058	0.05	0.01	0.05

Holm-Bonferroni method

	No correction	Bonferroni	HB
α	0.05	5×10^{-5}	5×10^{-5}
<i>FPR</i>	0.058	0	0
<i>FNR</i>	0	0.87	0.87



Holm-Bonferroni			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	0	4	4
Not significant	970	26	996
Total	970	30	1000

False discovery rate

$$FDR = \frac{FP}{D}$$

False discovery rate

False positive rate

$$FPR = \frac{FP}{m_0} = \frac{FP}{FP + TN}$$

The fraction of events with no effect we falsely marked as significant

$$FPR = \frac{56}{970} = 0.058$$

False discovery rate

$$FDR = \frac{FP}{D} = \frac{FP}{FP + TP}$$

The fraction of discoveries that are false

$$FDR = \frac{56}{86} = 0.65$$

No correction			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	<i>FP = 56</i>	<i>TP = 30</i>	86
Not significant	<i>TN = 914</i>	<i>FN = 0</i>	914
Total	970	30	1000

Benjamini-Hochberg method

Sort p-values


$$p_{(1)}, p_{(2)}, \dots, p_{(m)}$$

Find the largest k , such that

$$p_{(k)} \leq \frac{k}{m} \alpha$$

Reject all null hypotheses for
 $i = 1, \dots, k$


Benjamini-Hochberg
method controls FDR



k	p	α	$\frac{\alpha}{m}$	$\frac{\alpha}{m - k + 1}$	$\frac{k}{m} \alpha$
1	0.003	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01
2	0.005	0.05	0.01	0.0125	0.02
3	0.012	0.05	0.01	0.017	0.03
4	0.038	0.05	0.01	0.025	0.04
5	0.058	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.05

Benjamini-Hochberg method

	No correction	Bonferroni	HB	BH
α	0.05	5×10^{-5}	3.7×10^{-5}	0.0011
<i>FPR</i>	0.058	0	0	0.0021
<i>FNR</i>	0	0.87	0.87	0.30
<i>FDR</i>	0.65	0	0	0.087



Benjamini-Hochberg			
	No effect	Effect	Total
Significant	2	21	23
Not significant	968	9	977
Total	970	30	1000

Controlling FWER and FDR

Holm-Bonferroni
controls FWER
(family-wise error rate)

$$FWER = \Pr(FP \geq 1)$$

Controlling FWER - guaranteed

$$FWER \leq \alpha$$

Benjamini-Hochberg
controls FDR
(false discovery rate)

$$FDR = \frac{FP}{FP + TP}$$

Controlling FDR - guaranteed

$$\overline{FDR} \leq \alpha$$


Benjamini-Hochberg procedure controls FDR

Controlling FDR


$$\overline{FDR} \leq \alpha$$

$\overline{FDR}$ can be approximated by the mean over many experiments

Bootstrap: generate test data 10,000 times, perform 1000 t-tests for each set and find FDR for BH procedure



Adjusted p-values



p-values can be “adjusted”,
so they compare directly
with α , and not $\frac{k}{m}\alpha$

Problem: adjusted p-value
does not express any
probability

**Useful but mind the
interpretation**

How to do this in R

```
# Read generated data
> d <- read.table("http://tiny.cc/two_hypotheses", header=TRUE)
> p <- d$p

# Holm-Bonferroni procedure
> p.adj <- p.adjust(p, "holm")
> p[p.adj < 0.05]
[1] 1.476263e-05 2.662440e-05 3.029839e-05

# Benjamini-Hochberg procedure
> p.adj <- p.adjust(p, "BH")
> p[p.adj < 0.05]
[1] 1.038835e-03 6.670798e-04 1.050547e-03 1.476263e-05 5.271367e-04
[6] 3.503370e-04 9.664789e-04 1.068863e-03 7.995860e-04 5.404476e-04
[11] 9.681321e-04 1.580069e-04 1.732747e-04 3.159954e-04 2.662440e-05
[16] 4.709732e-04 1.517964e-04 2.873971e-04 3.258726e-04 4.087615e-04
[21] 3.029839e-05 9.320438e-04 1.713309e-04 2.863402e-04 4.082322e-04
```


Estimating false discovery rate

Control and estimate

Controlling FDR

1. Fix acceptable FDR limit, α , beforehand
2. Find a thresholding rule, so that

$$\overline{FDR} \leq \alpha$$


Estimating FDR

For each p-value, p_i , form a point estimate of FDR,


$$FDR(p_i)$$

P-value distribution

Data set 1
100% no effect




Data set 2
80% no effect,
20% real effect




P-value distribution

Good




Bad!



Definition of π_0

80% no effect, 20% effect



Proportion of no effects

$$\pi_0 = \frac{\#\{\text{no effect}\}}{\#\{\text{all tests}\}}$$

Total shaded area is 1 (because of normalization)


Area of the red rectangle is $\sim \pi_0$

Note

$\#\{\text{set}\}$ denotes number of elements in the set

Storey method: point estimate of FDR

80% no effect, 20% real effect



Point estimate, $FDR(p)$

First, estimate π_0

Arbitrary limit p , every $p_i < p$ is significant. No. of significant tests is

$$D(p) = \#\{p_i < p\}$$


No. of false positives is

$$FP(p) = p\pi_0 m$$

Hence,

$$FDR(p) = \frac{FP(p)}{D(p)} = \frac{p\pi_0 m}{\#\{p_i < p\}}$$

Storey method



Point estimate of FDR
This is the so-called q-value:

$$q(p_i) = FDR(p_i)$$

Interpretation of q-value

No.	ID	p-value	q-value
...	...	...	...
100	9249	0.000328	0.0266
101	8157	0.000328	0.0266
102	8228	0.000335	0.0269
103	8291	0.000338	0.0269
104	8254	0.000347	0.0272
105	8875	0.000348	0.0272
106	8055	0.000353	0.0273
107	8235	0.000375	0.0284
108	8148	0.000376	0.0284
109	8236	0.000381	0.0284
110	8040	0.000382	0.0284
...	...	...	...


There are 106 tests with $q \leq 0.0273$

Expect 2.7% of false positives among these tests.

Expect ~ 3 false positives if you set a limit of $q \leq 0.0273$ or $p \leq 0.00353$

q-value tells you how many false positives you should expect after choosing a significance limit

Q-values vs Benjamini-Hochberg



When $\hat{\pi}_0 = 1$, both methods give the same result.

For the same FDR, Storey's method provides more significant p-values.

Hence, it is more powerful, especially for small $\hat{\pi}_0$.

But this depends on how good the estimate of $\hat{\pi}_0$ is.

$\hat{\pi}_0$ - estimate of the proportion of null (no effect) tests

How to do this in R

```
> library(qvalue)
```

```
# Read data set 1
```

```
> pvalues <- read.table("http://tiny.cc/multi_FDR", header=TRUE)
```

```
> p <- pvalues$p
```

```
# Benjamini-Hochberg limit
```

```
> p.adj <- p.adjust(p, method="BH")
```

```
> length(p.adj <= 0.05)
```

```
[1] 216
```

```
# q-values
```

```
> qobj <- qvalue(p)
```

```
> q <- qobj$qv
```

```
> summary(qobj)
```





```
pi0:      0.8189884
```

```
Cumulative number of significant calls:
```


	<1e-04	<0.001	<0.01	<0.025	<0.05	<0.1	<1
p-value	40	202	611	955	1373	2138	10000
q-value	0	1	1	96	276	483	10000
local FDR	0	1	3	50	141	278	5915

```
> plot(qobj)
```

```
> hist(qobj)
```



Which multiple-test correction should I use?



False positive

“Discover” effect where there is no effect

Can be tested in follow-up experiments

Not hugely important in small samples

Impossible to manage in large samples

False negative

Missed discovery

Once you’ve missed it, it’s gone

Multiple test procedures: summary

Method	Controls	Advantages	Disadvantages	Recommendation
No correction	FPR	False negatives not inflated	Can result in $FP \gg TP$	Small samples, when the cost of FN is high
Bonferroni	FWER	None	Lots of false negatives	Do not use
Holm-Bonferroni	FWER	Slightly better than Bonferroni	Lots of false negatives	Appropriate only when you want to guard against any false positives
Benjamini-Hochberg	FDR	Good trade-off between false positives and negatives	On average, α of your positives will be false	Better in large samples
Storey	--	More powerful than BH, in particular for small $\hat{\pi}_0$	Depends on a good estimate of $\hat{\pi}_0$	The best method, gives more insight into FDR

Acronyms:

FP – false positives; TP – true positives; FN – false negatives; FPR – false positive rate; FWER – family-wise error rate; FDR – false discovery rate; $\hat{\pi}_0$ - estimate of the fraction of non-significant tests

Hand-outs available at
https://dag.compbio.dundee.ac.uk/training/Statistics_lectures.html